

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 01/14/2002 Kazumi Naito Q68095 6751 10/043,102 10/01/2003 23373 7590 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC **EXAMINER** 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. MAI, NGOCLAN THI WASHINGTON, DC 20037 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1742

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Offic Action Summary	10/043,102	NAITO, KAZUMI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	·
	Ngoclan T. Mai	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication of Period f r Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the field will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	30 June 2003		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.		•
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und			is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicat			
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-20</u> is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		,
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers	or election requirement.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac		the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in		,	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		•	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	,		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No			
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit of the second second	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional applicat	ion).
 a) The translation of the foreign language 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome 			
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper Notes 	5) Notice o	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	•

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 4-20 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Behrens teaches earth acid metal powder such as tantalum and niobium having high purity for use in the production of electrolytic capacitor having lower leakage as compare to metal powder of high impurity and Fife teaches that adding more than 500 ppm to 4,000 ppm nitrogen to niobium powder reduces the DC leakage in niobium anode. While Behrens prefers tantalum over niobium it does not teach away from the production and/or use of niobium having high purity in making capacitor anode. Since Behrens and Fife both concern about ways to improve the leakage of capacitor anode it would have been

Application/Control Number: 10/043,102

Art Unit: 1742

obvious to combine the teaching of both references to produce or obtain metal powder having desired characteristic for making anode capacitor.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed June 30, 2003 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-3 based upon 35 USC 103(a) as set forth in the last Office action because: the showing for the amounts of Co and Si each not to exceed 100 ppm by weight in niobium powder in order to provide a desired electrolytic capacitor having a reduced leakage is insufficient facts to overcome the rejection.

The facts presented are not germane to the rejection at issue because it does not show that Behrens rare earth acid contains either Si or Co or these metals in the amounts exceed the amounts claimed by the applicant. Note that Behrens is silent about these metals and therefore one can believe that the rare earth acid produced by Behrens' method does not contain these metals.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1742

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoclan T. Mai whose telephone number is (703) 306-4162. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00 PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703) 308-1146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

> Ngoclan T. Mai Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

n.m.